

**Padstow Town Council
Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group**

Notes of meeting of meeting held on Wednesday 25 July 2018 at 6.30 pm held at Padstow Town Council Offices, Station House, Station Road, Padstow

Present: Councillors A Rickard (Chairman), K Freeman, R Higman, H M Saunders, D N Vivian and C Watson-Smyth

In Attendance: Paul Weston (Community Consultant), Samantha Daly (Support Officer and note taker) and 1 member of the public

1. **Apologies:** There were no apologies
2. **Declarations of Interest:** There were no declarations of interest.
3. **Public Participation:** There was no public participation.
4. **Meeting Notes (25 April 2018 and 23 May 2018): RESOLVED** that the meeting notes were a true record of the meetings held on 25 April 2018 and 23 May 2018.
5. **Business Consultation:** It was that the Business Consultation report was the final report which now included the comments received from the follow-up consultations. The Consultant, Paul Weston commented that whilst responses were not high, the consultation had provided the opportunity to convey to a large number of businesses that the development of a Neighbourhood Plan was taking place. It was noted that the responses received closely mirrored the themes and topics raised at public consultations. He considered that in future it may be beneficial to consider a focused approach to business engagement.

One member considered that the limited responses needed to be addressed and that a greater reaction from businesses and employers was needed to inform expansion needs. Paul Weston agreed that the low response rate provided the group with a challenge and that the proposed survey of Treceus Industrial Estate businesses would address this in part.

Action: The Business Consultation Report be accepted and noted.

6. **Youth Engagement Update:**
 - a) **Padstow School/Pre-School Youth Survey:** The Steering Group (SG) noted the report. Comment was made that several of the issues raised were related to land use and that, as outlined in the summary conclusion, responses would add to the overall evidence. It was noted that as significant was that contact had been established with the local school children, raising community awareness of the project.

One member considered that whilst it was helpful promotion, most of the issues cited were beneficial only to Padstow Town Council and not the Neighbourhood Plan.

It was suggested by another member that in fact many of the issues covered were pertinent to the NDP, with many linked to open space

facilities for children and others linked to future infrastructure. He also felt that some comments demonstrated support for the NDP aims and objectives.

Action: The Padstow School/Pre-School Youth Survey Report be accepted and noted.

b) Update Eden Project: The report outlined in more detail the verbal update provided by the Town Clerk at the SG's May meeting. The SG was asked which, if any, of the suggestions they would like to progress and how. Members considered that this item needed to be taken forward by a working group. The SG was asked to consider what brief a working group should be given, if the working group were to work up proposals or generate further ideas.

As the school holidays had begun, another suggestion was to approach young people to canvass opinion on engagement methods they would like to participate in.

Members discussed their thoughts on the methods listed and agreed that they would like to see MapJams and the Community Graffiti Project further investigated. Some members felt that MapJams had been particularly helpful when developing the Parish Plan some years ago.

Action: Members of the Working Group should be approached for volunteers to investigate and work up proposals for youth engagement to include consideration of MapJams and a Community Graffiti Project, in consultation with the Town Clerk.

7. Working Group Note (18 June): RESOLVED to receive the Working Group note.

A member read aloud an email that had been received by a member of the public from the Office. The member of the public had emailed the Office in July to register an interest in helping with the NDP. The member did not consider the response correct in relation to availability of tasks. The Chairman advised the matter would be addressed.

8. Task Specific Working Groups:

Countryside Task Group: Paul Weston reported that the required maps were in hand. The outstanding work related to the condition of the public rights of way. The group were progressing as outlined in the agenda report and had indicated that they should complete the task by the end of August.

a) Built Environment: Paul Weston advised he had yet to receive any firm information but understood that the group were progressing in their task to produce a first list of non-listed Heritage Assets, an initial list of potential 'local green spaces' and a proposed town centre boundary line. It was thought a good idea that progress should be shared by the end of August. The TG should also be asked if, as a result of their deliberation so far, they would like any additional questions included in the Community Survey.

Consideration was given to appendix 3, a business survey of Treceus Industrial Estate. Paul Weston suggested that, if the Steering Group approved, the survey should be issued as soon as possible with a return date of 2 weeks. It was noted that based on the number, the Maintenance Team were able to hand deliver and collect these. The Support Officer advised that the survey required formatting and the insertion of appropriate "top and tailing" including necessary references to data protection.

Action: The Town Clerk/RFO to contact the Countryside and Built Environment Task Groups to request an update and details of their progress be shared at the end of August. Further, that any potential questions arising as a result of deliberations, must be received in 1 weeks' time to be considered for inclusion in the Community Survey.

Action: The Treceus Industrial Estate survey be approved subject to presentation formatting and the inclusion of an appropriate introduction and end to the survey, including any necessary data protection information. These changes to be delegated to the Town Clerk/RFO in consultation with the NDP SG Chairman. Survey to be hand delivered by the Maintenance Team as soon as possible and responses collected after 2 weeks by the same.

b) Growth Impact: The Chairman and Consultant considered that the recent discussion session had been a most constructive session, with good debate between participants whose experiences and interests were suitably varied. Paul Weston advised that appendix 4 was a summary of the TG's agreed conclusions and recommendations. He clarified that if the SG were to accept the policy approach recommended by the TG, it would be used to move forward, however it would still remain open to alteration, refinement and community endorsement. This could take place through further consultation in September and again during the consultation of the Draft Plan.

There was much discussion on this item. In response to queries from a member, Paul Weston provided the following clarifications regarding the group's conclusions:

Housing demand: As indicated in the agenda paper, the TG had considered a briefing paper prior to the session that included the current housing context set by the Local Plan (LP). The TG's conclusion was that the outstanding LP requirement of 53 houses was probably insufficient to satisfy long-term demands. It was noted that the group had discussed at length an appropriate up-lift on the number of dwellings required in addition to the strategic target, taking into account the strategies of other areas and what planning inspectors had considered acceptable in other places.

Under the new National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority would now be required to review their strategic targets each year. Cornwall Council was expected to issue its new figures in August. A member suggested that a decision in this regard should be delayed until these were available and expressed concern that there was no recognition

of the AONB. Paul Weston advised that the TG had concluded in respect of AONB that the current Local Plan Policy should prevail.

Settlement Boundaries: The TG had not made a recommendation for a settlement boundary for Trevone as it was within the AONB. The TG felt that a settlement boundary would provide a presumption in favour of development which they did not recommend for Trevone. It did consider however, that it could be put forward as an exception site for development based on specific criteria.

There was further discussion concerning settlement boundaries, Paul Weston advised that settlement boundaries should relate to other policies which support development, as an NDP had to be pro-development.

Second Home Policy: The TG was not convinced that a second home policy would be appropriate for the Parish. They had been advised that, when applied to St Ives, the affect had been to slow down new housing development and focus second home owners on existing dwellings in the town. As a result, the TG also recommended an amendment to question 10 of the community survey, so as not to commit to a policy. It considered that second home policy impact elsewhere should be monitored before any policy commitment was made for Padstow and Trevone.

Action: The conclusions of the Growth Impact Task Group be accepted and their recommend policy approach, as outlined in appendix 4, be approved as the preferred approach until community consultation takes place. Councillor Saunders requested his name be recorded as voting against this decision.

Action: Q10 of the draft community survey be amended to say "Do you think we should consider restricting growth in the number of second homes and holiday lets?"

c) Community Survey:

Appendix 5: Members were referred to the statements in appendix 5 prepared by the Community Survey TG.

Action: The statements in appendix 5, agenda page 36, be accepted as statements.

Consideration was given to the questions in appendix 5 prepared by the Community Survey TG and the additional paper prepared by the Consultant regarding the same.

1: Question response method: One member considered that a nuanced response option including "no opinion" would provide a clearer understanding of what the community thought. In response, the Consultant explained that the purpose of the questionnaire, to ascertain whether the community were generally supportive of the policy approach being taken or not, called for a more binary approach. If a more nuanced approach were adopted, then when analysing responses in this instance, responses would be combined to provide a total for those answers which agreed and those which disagreed with neutral answers being disregarded. Therefore, if any questions were answered with a majority

of “no opinion” or “don’t know” the response would be ambiguous and unhelpful in the context of the survey. It was suggested that wording could be amended to make it clearer that if respondents truly had no opinion, the question could be left unanswered.

Another member suggested that he did not have a problem with the way the answers would be analysed but did feel that a more nuanced style would encourage people to think more about their answers.

Action: No change be made to the response method in the draft questionnaire. Instructional text to be made clearer with regard to instances where the respondent is of “no opinion”. Councillor Saunders requested his name be recorded as voting against this decision.

2. Additional Settlement Boundary Questions: A member considered that the NDP should have a tight settlement boundary around both Padstow and Trevone. The majority of members were satisfied that at present the question was to establish whether or not there was support in principle for settlement boundaries.

Action: The settlement boundary question in the draft questionnaire remain as an in the principle question. No further settlement boundary questions be included. Councillor Saunders requested his name be recorded as voting against this decision.

3. Structure: Question was raised as to whether the current structure would raise community expectations regarding matters which were relevant but not as significant to the NDP, Q13 being an example.

In response, the Consultant advised that the questionnaire was about what an NDP could influence and all questions were valid in this respect. Responses could lead to policies which could influence services and facilities through for example, “in principle” support for shared facilities and the protection of existing, or facilitation of new, facilities.

Action: No change be made the structure of the questions as they appear in the questionnaire. Councillor Saunders requested his name be recorded as voting against this decision.

4. Additional Free Text Questions: Members considered it useful to include the 2 additional free text questions identified by the TG.

Action: Two questions be included after question 32 in the draft questionnaire relating to living in the Padstow area, these being i) What aspects are least attractive to you?; and ii) Are there any other matters not already covered you wish to comment on?

5. Name: Members considered the TG’s question regarding the inclusion of the respondents name in the “About You” section of the draft questionnaire. Several members considered that this had no bearing on the survey and did not serve any purpose.

One member suggested that the name would provide information as to which members of the electoral roll had received and responded to the

survey. Also considering that it would provide a unique identifier for responses from multiple occupation households. The Support Officer advised that there was no system to cross-check names for this purpose; Padstow Town Council was not allowed the full electoral roll for the Parish. It was noted by another Councillor that electoral roll information issued to Councillors following their election in May had needed to be returned and was not for use. He further added that planned further consultation would provide a "fall back" to capture those who did not respond.

It was suggested that personal data be limited to only that for which there was good reason. Therefore, it was suggested not to request the respondents name and to replace the request for house and postcode details with a question regarding the location in which the respondent lives. To accommodate multiple occupation households whilst reducing the opportunity for misuse, a limit of 4 responses per IP address could be imposed for the online survey.

Action: The "About You" section of the draft questionnaire not be amended to include "Name". The request for "House Name/Number" and "Postcode" in Q.33 to be replaced with a question regarding the location of the respondent. The online survey to be limited to 4 responses per IP address.

6. Employment: Query was raised as to the rationale for including, or not, a question concerning the employment status of respondents. Mention was made that the NDP was also about the future of the Parish and information regarding the skew of responses could be helpful. It was thought that perhaps it would be more helpful if an analysis of any skew was based on the respondent's age rather than employment. It was suggested that under Q34 the option "Under 18 be added".

Action: No question be added to the draft questionnaire regarding employment status. Q34 of the draft questionnaire to be amended as follows: i) "under 25" be amended to "18-25"; and ii) an "under 18" option be added.

Appendix 6: Members were referred to appendix 6 and matters for consideration following a meeting between the Community Survey TG, the NDP SG Chairman and Council Officers.

1. Printing: The Support Officer had obtained an indicative cost, based on the maximum quantity likely to be required and current questionnaire length, plus covering letter. It was noted that the final cost would be dependent on the final size and number of surveys required, as such it was suggested a maximum cost be set to avoid delay.

Action: The printing of the community survey to be outsourced at a maximum cost of £1,000 to be taken from the NDP budget.

2. Posting: Members gave consideration to delivery methods and generally preferred that the survey be sent as addressed mail. The Support Officer highlighted a need for support in labelling the 2000+ envelopes due to current officer commitments. It was noted that costs were for 2nd class business mail and would require the creation of a

business account with Royal Mail. It was agreed that C5 was the preferred option should the final survey size allow.

There was some discussion regarding the possibility of Trevone volunteers hand delivering the surveys to all Trevone residences. The Support Officer advised that this would require volunteers to sift the addresses first.

Action: A Royal Mail Business Account be arranged and the community survey be sent by 2nd class letter as addressed Business Mail at an indicative cost of £637.40 plus VAT. Any additional postage costs required to be taken from the NDP budget, in particular increased costs as a result of the final survey size. Councillor Saunders requested his name be recorded as voting against this decision.

3. Envelopes: The Support Officer highlighted that support would be needed to help fill envelopes due to current Officer capacity. She tabled a "mock-up" of an envelope suggested by the TG. The envelope pictured an extreme overdevelopment of the area and was intended to stand out amongst other mail. A strap line was included for illustrative purposes.

Caution was expressed at using an image which was negative and emotive and not directly addressed within the content of the survey. It was suggested that members consider alternative photographs and send in suggestions within the next week. Consideration was also given to a strap line for the envelope. Generally it was thought this should simply read "Neighbourhood Plan Survey".

The Support Officer had obtained an indicative cost for the envelopes and updated at the meeting that with the additional printing of the Business Mail bar code, this would be in the region of £340 plus VAT for C5 and £460 plus VAT for C4.

Action: The photograph on the envelope "mock-up" be replaced with a positive Parish image, members to submit suggestions to the office within 1 week, final choice to be delegated to the Town Clerk / RFO in consultation with the Community Survey TG. "Neighbourhood Plan Survey" to be included on the front of the envelope. Printing to be outsourced, size dependant on final survey length and cost taken from NDP budget. To avoid delay final proof to be signed off by the Town Clerk/RFO in consultation with the NDP SG Chairman.

4. SurveyMonkey: Members were supportive of the suggestion as outlined in the agenda paper.

Action: SurveyMonkey be purchased at a cost of £408.00 to be taken from the NDP budget and an online version of the Community Survey set up. Sign off of the online survey to be delegated to the Town Clerk/RFO in consultation with the NDP SG Chairman.

5. Hard Copy Collection: Members were referred to the agenda report. Members were supportive of purchasing a freepost return address. It was

suggested that an addressed envelope be included with the survey to encourage responses. One member advised that printed bar codes were now required on all freepost return addresses and suggested that both the barcode and address be outsourced for printing. Members were supportive of the TG arranging door to door championing to promote participation in the survey and of hard copies being entered on to SurveyMonkey.

Action: NDP freepost return address to be purchased for hard copy returns at an estimated cost of £219 + VAT plus the cost of first class postage for all items received. Cost to be taken from the NDP budget.

Action: Freepost address to be printed on C5 envelopes by external printer and, if required, a postage barcode be printed at the same time. Cost to be taken from the NDP budget.

Action: Community Survey TG to organise door to door championing of the survey.

Action: Hard copy responses to be entered onto SurveyMonkey.

6. Covering Letter: Action: The survey covering letter be prepared from the Chairman of the Council by the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chairman of the Council and NDP SG Chairman to include details regarding special needs support, online response options and drop box locations.

7. Correspondence to Self-Catering agencies: Action: Town Clerk to contact self catering agencies to request survey details be passed to second home owner clients. Community Survey TG be requested to provide list of agencies.

8. Promotional Banners: The Support Officer updated that Padstow School had yet to respond regarding the school railings opposite Tesco and the school was now closed for the summer. Members considered it a good idea to place a banner on the railings outside Station House and that it be a double sided banner for multipurpose use.

Action: Double sided outdoor PVC banner to be purchased at a cost of £55.00 plus VAT, wording and design to be delegated to the Town Clerk in consultation with Community Survey TG and NDP SG Chairman.

9. Manned Stand: Suggested location, Tesco foyer.

Action: Tesco be approached for permission and availability, preferably the Friday and Saturday prior to distribution, stand to be manned by Councillors Rickard, Higman and Vivian and Community Survey TG member Gill Vivian.

10. Posters and leaflets: Members were happy that posters be distributed in the usual locations. In addition it was suggested that leaflets be sent home with school children in September. It was noted that Council's social media pages would also be used to promote the same.

Action: Posters and leaflets promoting the community survey be designed and distributed and to avoid delay, design approval be delegated to the Town Clerk in consultation with the NDP SG Chairman.

11. Local Advertising: Members discussed this item and concluded that the North Cornwall Advertiser was not widely distributed within the Parish and for this reason the SG did not wish to pursue this option. Members felt that an advert in the Church Magazine would be beneficial.

Action: The community survey be promoted in the local Church Magazine, content to be delegated to the Town Clerk/RFO in Consultation with NDP SG Chairman.

12. Local Championing: The importance of positive local championing was noted.

Despatch: Members gave consideration to a preferred date of despatch and response period.

Action: The community survey to be issued as soon as possible in September 2018 and a response period of 4 weeks provided.

Appendix 7: Members gave consideration to Appendix 7, the draft Community Survey. It was noted that the survey had been approved as a working draft and passed to a TG for comment which had been considered. As such it was generally felt that further revisions should be only minor amendments.

Query was raised that one question was written as presumptive of an answer and two members expressed concern with the wording of Q1 and its literal meaning.

It was suggested that taking into account the changes agreed during the meeting, any further comments regarding adjustments to the wording of the existing draft questions be sent to Paul Weston within 1 week.

Action: Members to send suggested adjustments to the wording of the draft questions to the Consultant within 1 week. To avoid delay approval of amendments be delegated to the Town Clerk in consultation with the NDP SG Chairman.

The Steering Group considered the Task Groups recommendation to encourage participation by way of an optional prize draw. Members were supportive of the idea but felt that the prize, a £50 Tesco voucher, should be funded by the Town Council and not Tesco as suggested by the TG.

The Support Officer advised that the survey would need to satisfy the new Data Protection regulations and appropriate wording would need to be included, particularly with reference to the prize draw. She suggested that any personal data be entered on to a tear off section at the bottom of the survey and that the Office put the survey into a pleasing format.

Action: A prize draw incentive be added to the Community Survey. Prize being a £50 Tesco voucher to be taken from the NDP budget.

Action: A tear off section be added for the purpose of any necessary personal data and any relevant consents and data protection information added to the survey to ensure GDPR compliance. The survey be amended to include any required data protection wording be. To avoid delay, these changes, general formatting and final sign-off of the Community Survey to be delegated to the Town Clerk/RFO in consultation with the NDP SG Chairman.

Members considered a query from the Town Clerk that Q32 be amended to include [Number 1 being the most important] at the end. Members did not consider this necessary.

Action: No amendment be made to Q32 in respect of the Town Clerk's query outlined in the agenda report.

- 9. Mapping:** Paul Weston provided an update on this item. As the plan progressed it was estimated that there would be a need for approx 8 good quality electronic maps/documents for exhibition purposes. These could be produced by outside agencies, including Cornwall Council, but at some cost. He noted that other neighbourhood planning groups had successfully produced their own maps using access to a mapping facility provided free to NDP groups by Cornwall Council. Further, he advised that TG member Jon Pascoe had recently been very helpful with maps relating to settlement boundaries and suggested that the SG may wish to approach him to take on this role.

Action: Town Clerk/RFO to approach Jon Pascoe to request assistance with the preparation of the group's future mapping needs.

- 10. Project Plan and Budget Update:** It was noted that the project plan had been updated to reflect progress which had been significant in the last 12 months. The budget update was noted as per the agenda report.
- 11. Date of Next Meeting:** To be confirmed.

The meeting ended at 8.33 pm.